DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 266 TM 003 227

AUTHOR Faunce, R. W.; And Others
TITLE The Minneapolis Public School Administrators' Workshop Conference on Integration: St. John's University, August 16-18, 1972. An Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO C-72-11
PUB DATE Apr 73
NOTE 41p.; DIR-1

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Conference Reports; Participant Characteristics; *Program Evaluation; *Questionnaires; *Racial Integration; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS Minneapolis Public Schools

ABSTRACT

"Humanizing our schools--preparation for development of integrated environments for learning" was the theme of this workshop conference for more than 250 Minneapolis Public School administrators. The goals of the conference were open communications on the topic of desegregation, discussions relevant to this topic, active involvement of participants, and the acquisition of useful knowledge about steps to be taken toward integration. The conference was evaluated by use of a questionnaire distributed to all participants who attended the closing session (n = 225). A total of 200 questionnaires were returned. The questions were related to the goals of the conference plus three additional questions related to the reactions of the participants to presentations made by consultants, conference arrangements and facilities, with the final question designed to determine if reaction to the conference was related to participant characteristics, e.g., experience, sex, race, etc. The questionnaire data showed that the conference made moderate progress toward its goals. The greatest differences in response to program activities occurred between black and white administrators; these differences were variable. A number of differences were also noted between male and female reactions, but these were directed more at conference facilities than program content. The percent participants' responses are provided in relation to each of the questions. (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083266

Research and Evaluation

TM 003 227

Educational Services

Minneapolis Public Schools

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BOARD OF EDUCATION

W. Harry Davis, Chairman

Frank E. Adams — Mrs. Marilyn A. Borea — Philip A. Olson

Richard F. Allen — John M. Mason — David W. Preus

Superintendent of Schools

John B. Davis, Jr.

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Special School District No. 1

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

ISC—Publications 1973

ED 083266

Minneapolis Public Schools

The Minneapolis Public School Administrators' Workshop Conference on Integration: St. John's University August 16-18, 1972 An Evaluation

R. W. Faunce,
Sara Clark
and
Bonna Nesset

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

April 1973
C-72-11

Minneapolis Public Schools

The Minneapolis Public School Administrators' Workshop Conference on Integration: St. John's University August 16-18, 1973 An Evaluation

Summary

	See page
"Humanizing our schools--preparation for development of integrated environments for learning" was the theme of a three-day workshop conference for more than 250 Minneapolis Public School administrators in August 1972. Reactions of the conference participants are described in this report.	1
The conference program was developed by the schools' Leadership Development Committee with the assistance of the University of Minnesota's Institute for Desegregation.	
The 1972 St. John's conference appeared to have made moderate progress toward its four major goals. The goals were open communications on the topic of desegregation, discussions relevant to this topic, active involvement of participants, and the acquisition of useful knowledge about steps to be taken towards integration.	4
Conference participants felt that open communications on the topic of desegregation took place. They felt that group discussions were relevant to the theme of the conference, and most felt they had gained knowledge about steps to be taken to improve integration in the schools--although the knowledge tended to be more general than specific.	6-8
Progress towards these three goals was somewhat marred by the fact tht only half of the administrators reported feeling actively involved in conference activities. Additionally, communications, relevance, and involvement, declined as the day progressed. The morning sessions were consistently rated more favorably than afternoon sessions.	9
Little difference occurred in the reaction of participants to the small and large group sessions in terms of overall reaction. However, when degree of response was considered it appeared that the small group sessions were more effective in achieving objectives.	9
About seven out of ten participants reported that the contributions made by the outside consultants were satisfactory. Two out of ten said they were excellent and about one in ten (12%) said that the consultants were not satisfactory.	11
Despite extremely uncomfortable temperature and humidity, the majority of participants felt the St. John location was an excellent one and voted to return there for future conferences. Facilities, living accomodations and food were given favorable ratings. Program administration procedures such as registration, were also carried out with little difficulty.	19
Some variations in the reaction to the program and the facilities were noted for some groups of conference participants.	21
Recommendations for future conferences are given.	27

* * *

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Description of the Conference.	1
II.	Evaluation Questions	4
III.	Evaluation Design.	4
IV.	Results.	6
	Did open communications on the topic of desegregation take place?	6
	Were the group discussions relevant to the theme of the conference?.	7
	Did administrators feel actively involved in conference activities?. . . .	7
	Did participants feel they gained knowledge about steps to be taken to improve integration in the schools? . . .	8
	Were small and large group sessions equally effective in accomplishing conference objectives?.	9
	How valuable were the presentations made by the consultants hired by the Institute for Desegregation?.	11
	How did participants react to conference arrangements and facilities?.	19
	Was there a variation in reaction to the conference related to participant characteristics?.	21
V.	Discussion and Conclusions	25
VI.	Recommendations.	27
	Appendix A	
	Participant Questionnaire Responses (Percent).	29

List of Tables

Number		Page
1	Differences Between A.M. and P.M. Groups and Between Small and Large Groups for Positive and Very Positive Responses. . . .	10
2	Percentage of Conference Participants Reacting Favorably or Very Favorably to Each Consultant for Each of the Four Major Conference Goals.	12
3	Percentage of Conference Participants Reacting Very Favorably to Each Consultant for Each of the Four Major Conference Goals	15
4	Consultants Ranked by Percentage of Very Favorable Ratings and by Combined Ratings of Very Favorable and Favorable for Each of Four Conference Goals.	17
5	What impact do you think this conference had?	18
6	How do you feel about each of these conference arrangements?.	19

Minneapolis Public Schools

The Minneapolis Public School Administrators'
Workshop Conference on Integration:
St. John's University
August 16-18, 1972

An Evaluation

This evaluation of the Minneapolis Public School Administrators' Workshop Conference of August 1972 was conducted by the Research and Evaluation Department at the request of the Leadership Development Committee.

A brief description of the conference is given first. The evaluation questions asked are then listed, followed by a description of the evaluation design.

Results are then given, followed by a discussion and conclusions. Finally, recommendations are made for the next conference.

I. Description of the Conference

The following description of the conference is excerpted from the Minneapolis School Bulletin of September 15, 1972.

4th Annual Workshop Held at St. John's

Over 280 Minneapolis administrators returned to the rolling hills of St. John's University at Collegeville, Minn., for the 4th Annual Workshop Conference, August 16, 17 and 18.

The theme of this conference was "Humanizing Our Schools -- Preparation for Development of Integrated Environments for Learning." After Wednesday noon registration, delegates heard Rufus Webster, Intergroup Education Dept., outline the conference overviews and objectives.

KEYNOTER

Dr. Stanley Campbell, recent Superintendent of the Indianapolis Public Schools, gave the keynote speech in which he drew on his experience to predict that in Mpls. "the political, economic and social milieu is right for integration." He said that every American must have the right to equality of educational opportunity -- and this means an integrated education.

Wednesday evening sessions geared to enhance openness in communication provided for a re-grouping into more manageable

sessions of 15 persons. Throughout the remainder of the conference on Thursday and Friday, these smaller groups worked on independent projects. From time to time they rejoined larger groups for the interchange of ideas and discussions. Recorders were assigned to provide feedback and eventually these recorders assimilated their findings into conference recommendations. On Friday morning the conference participants gathered to hear a summary report of these recommendations.

Preparation for the conference began last April when members of the Leadership Development Committee contacted the Institute for Desegregation at the U. of M.

A series of meetings between the two organizations resulted in a collaborative decision as to the nature and content of this conference. Originally each participant of the previous summer's conference was polled as to their suggestions for this year's format. Generally, they related to these major topics: Communication, Quality Education, Humanizing Our Schools, Desegregation and Human Relations. The conference theme was developed from these topics. After an analysis of these areas, the subject matter was finalized under these headings:

1. Client-System Interaction
2. Desegregation/Integration (Policies & Issues)
3. Curriculum in Desegregated Settings
4. Staff/Human Relations in Desegregation

Since the conference design placed strong emphasis on the personal involvement and action of the participants, over 20 trained consultants from across the nation were provided to facilitate communication and serve as resource and/or panel members.

Supt. John B. Davis, Jr. gave the summary address on Friday noon and received a standing ovation for his extemporaneous remarks. Pointed toward problems and concerns of our schools' Desegregation/Integration plans, he emphasized the inherent rightness of the Desegregation/Integration plan. "The plan will take place -- because it is right." He called for total commitment on the part of faculty and staff to the accomplishment of the plan and expressed his complete confidence that the necessary force and commitment are present.

To understand the evaluation results, a brief description of how the program operated is necessary. Each of the four major topics were subdivided into four groups. These groups, and the consultants who made presentations to each group are shown on page 3.

A. Client System

1. School Community - William Self
2. Student Rights and Responsibilities - Phyllis Greer
3. Child Advocacy - Geri Steiner
4. Crisis Intervention - Frank Wilderson

B. Desegregation/Integration (Policies & Issues)

1. Community Issues in Desegregation/Integration - Grant Hawkins/ William Clark
2. Policies for Desegregation/Integration - Charles Glatt
3. Legal Responsibility in Quality Education - Lloyd Barbee
4. Problems in Quality Education - William Jones

C. Curriculum in Desegregated Settings

1. Multi-cultural Curriculum Materials - Pete Kontos & (R. Buffalohead in PM)
2. Creative Teaching Strategies and Techniques - John Mormon
3. Open Classroom - Desegregation - Edward Ignas
4. Ability Grouping in Desegregation - John Taborn

D. Staff/Human Relations in Desegregation

1. Recruiting, hiring, effective utilization of minority professionals - Wayne Carle
2. Professional staff development in desegregation - Charles Rivers
3. Recruiting, hiring, effective utilization of minority non-professionals - Ray Kemp/James Guines
4. Non-professional staff development - Wendell Roye

Each conference participant heard presentations on two topics. Either topics A_1 and C_1 or A_2 and C_2 or A_3 and C_3 or A_4 and C_4. Similar combinations were available for B and D groups. Each of these presentations were made to groups of about 15 participants. Presentations were made from 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. and from 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. on Thursday. Thus, a participant who heard the A_1 presentation at 8:30 would hear the C_1 presentation at 3:30. These groups of 15 participants were referred to as "small groups."

After each small group presentation, two small groups joined for discussion. Thus, A_1 met with A_2, A_3 met with A_4, and so on. This joint meeting of two small groups, totalling 30 participants, was called a "large group" meeting. Large groups met from 10:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. and from 7:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

By 8:30 p.m. Thursday, each participant had heard two presentations in small groups (e.g. A_1 and C_1) and had also discussed two additional topics in larger group meetings (e.g. A_1 and A_2; C_1 and C_2). Each participant, therefore, benefitted from the presentations of at least four consultants (some consultants worked in pairs), either directly -- as in the small groups -- or indirectly through the large group discussions.

A Friday morning panel was to present the results of the joint sessions, thus bringing together the information and deliberations of all 16 subgroups.

II. Evaluation Questions

In July 1972, the Leadership Development Committee asked the Research and Evaluation Department to help obtain answers to five questions about the conference:

1. Did open communications on the topic of desegregation take place?
2. Were the group discussions relevant to the theme of the conference?
3. Did administrators feel actively involved in conference activities?
4. Did participants feel they gained knowledge about steps to be taken to improve integration in the schools?
5. Were small and large group sessions equally effective in accomplishing conference objectives?

Further discussions with Leadership Development Committee representatives, the superintendent, and a staff member from the University of Minnesota's Institute for Desegregation resulted in additional questions:

6. How valuable were the presentations made by the consultants hired by the Institute for Desegregation?
7. How did participants react to conference arrangements and facilities?
8. Was there a variation in reaction to the conference related to participant characteristics? e.g. experience, sex, race, etc.

III. Evaluation Design

Responses to all evaluation questions were obtained from a questionnaire developed by the Leadership Development Committee, the Research and Evaluation Department, and the Institute for Desegregation.

Questionnaires were distributed to all participants attending the closing session, just prior to the Superintendent's summarization of conference activities. All responses were made anonymously.

It appears that virtually all administrators present at the closing session completed questionnaires. Two hundred questionnaires were received from the 225 people present. Twenty-five consultants made presentations at the conference and many of these consultants were present at the final session. Presumably, they did not complete questionnaires.

Because of the number of sub-group analyses required, all questionnaire responses were converted to keypunch cards to facilitate computer operations. The questionnaire was precoded for this purpose.

Each of the major evaluation questions was analyzed by sub-groups as well as by total response. The following contrasts were made:

1. a.m. versus p.m. sessions
2. Small group sessions (15) vs. large group sessions (30).
3. Males vs. females (questionnaire item Q)
4. Elementary vs. Secondary affiliation (item L)
5. By job title (item K). Because of small numbers, some categories were combined. Responses were compared for superintendents and directors (1 and 3); principals (2); and consultants, project administrators, administrative interns, and others (4, 5, 6, 7).
6. Years of experience as a school administrator (0) 0-3, 4-6, 7-12, more than 12 years.
7. Experience working with Black people (R). Ratings 1, 2, 3 (little experience) vs. ratings 4, 5 (a lot of experience)
8. Experience working with Indians (S). Ratings 1, 2 (little or no experience) vs. ratings 3, 4, 5 (some experience). The neutral rating (3) was added to the high experience group in order to get a sufficient number of administrators for contrast purposes.
9. Black vs. non-Black administrators. Racial identification was not included on the questionnaire. Participants were asked to write in their racial identification. For purposes of this evaluation, non-Blacks is synonymous with whites. The number of non-Blacks other than whites is so small that their inclusion in the non-Black category does not present serious distortion.

IV. Results

Usable questionnaires were obtained from 200 of the 261 officially registered administrators at the conference. (The School Bulletin estimate of 280 probably included the hired consultants). Since virtually everyone who attended the final summarization meeting completed questionnaires it appears that the 61 missing administrators were those who had to leave St. John's on Thursday evening or early Friday. Some administrators may have still been on the campus but did not attend the final session for various reasons.

The effect of these missing administrators on the evaluation is indeterminate, but the most logical assumption is that the evaluation results might appear more favorable than they would if all 261 administrators had responded.

Evaluation Question 1: Did open communications on the topic of desegregation take place?

Three items in the questionnaire focussed on communications. Administrators were asked, "How would you describe the exchange of ideas in each of your Thursday groups?" Responses available were: very free and open exchange, some exchange of ideas, very guarded or defensive, and did not attend or other answers. Responses were given for the a.m. small group of 15, the a.m. large group of 30, the p.m. small group, and the p.m. large group.

Additionally, the questionnaire contained a checklist of twelve items and participants were asked to check as many items as were appropriate to answer the question "What impact do you think this conference had?" Two items dealt with communications: Improved my communications with other school personnel, and Improved my communications with cabinet level administrators.

A number of write-in comments also referred to communications.

Generally, the answer to evaluation question No. 1 is Yes. Open communications on the topic of desegregation did take place. But there are qualifications. About three out of ten participants thought a "Very free and open exchange" of ideas took place; about half said that "some exchange of ideas" took place and about one in seven respondents described the communications as "very guarded or defensive." Although most responses were favorable, the majority of administrators had only a moderately

positive view of the openness of communications during the Thursday sessions.

Black administrators, more than non-Blacks, felt the discussions were guarded or defensive in the large group sessions. More Blacks and non-Blacks felt the afternoon large group session was guarded compared with the morning large group session. In the p.m. large group session, more than half the Black administrators (54%) reported guarded or defensive discussions, compared with 19% of non-Blacks.

Furthermore, communications deteriorated as the day progressed. Administrators had less favorable views of the exchange of ideas in the afternoon than they had in the morning. By the time the large groups (of thirty) met in the afternoon, fully one in five administrators felt communications were defensive or guarded.

Evaluation Question 2: Were the group discussions relevant to the theme of the conference?

Yes. Almost nine out of ten administrators felt the discussions were at least somewhat relevant to the conference theme. Opinions were about evenly divided as to whether the discussions were "very relevant" (42%) or "somewhat relevant" (45%).

A distinct dropoff in relevance from morning to afternoon was noted. In the morning sessions, 93% reported at least some relevance. Only 81% of the afternoon participants reported at least some relevance.

Differences between large and small groups were relatively small and did not consistently favor either of these groups compared with differences between morning and afternoon sessions which were large and consistently favored the morning groups. "Some" relevance was reported by a slightly higher percentage of administrators for the groups of 30, but a higher percentage of administrators reported the discussions in the groups of 15 as "very relevant."

The discussions appeared to be more relevant for secondary school administrators than for administrators who work with elementary schools; more relevant for women than men; more relevant for Blacks than non-Blacks; and more relevant for administrators who said they had little experience working with Indians than for those who said they had a lot of experience.

Evaluation Question 3: Did administrators feel actively involved in conference activities?

About half did. Only 50% of the administrators reported that they felt actively involved in their Thursday groups. Another third said

they weren't involved, but that the opportunity to be involved was there if they wanted it. From 10% to 15% said there was not enough opportunity for them to be involved.

As with communications, involvement dropped off as the day progressed. More than half the administrators (55%) reported active involvement in the morning session; less than half (45%) reported active involvement in the afternoon session.

Group size also was related to involvement. About 58% of all administrators reported being actively involved in the small groups but only 42% reported involvement in the large groups. Administrators not involved in the large group sessions did not blame their non-participation on lack of opportunity, however. Whether reacting to the small group or the large group, a similar percentage of administrators--about 10 to 15%--reported no opportunity for involvement.

Responses of various sub-groups were also compared. Comparisons were made by sex (i.e. males vs. females), race, job title (superintendents and directors; principals; consultants and others) level (elementary; secondary; elementary and secondary), length of experience, experience working with Black people, experience working with Indians.

None of these comparisons yielded statistically significant differences. For all practical purposes, involvement was seen the same way by all sub-groups.

Evaluation Question 4: Did participants feel they gained knowledge about steps to be taken to improve integration in the schools?

To a degree. About eight out of ten administrators reported they gained at least some useful knowledge. The extent of knowledge gained, and its specificity, were limited, however. Only about two out of ten respondents said they gained "much" useful information while six out of ten reported "some" useful information had been obtained. Only 16% reported that "specific steps" for desegregation had been provided and only 9% reported a general model for desegregation had been given.

Overall, there was relatively little difference in knowledge gained from small and large group sessions or morning and afternoon sessions. Differences which did occur tended to favor small groups and morning sessions. The small group session in the morning appeared more productive than the small group session in the afternoon.

More superintendents and directors reported gaining much useful knowledge (36%) than did principals, consultants, or other administrators (about 15%). More than one in four principals (28%) reported no gain in knowledge compared with one in ten superintendents and directors.

More women (32%) than men (13%) reported they gained much useful knowledge.

Evaluation Question 5: Were small and large group sessions equally effective in accomplishing conference objectives?

The answer to this question isn't easy. If positive and negative reactions are compared in the grossest sense, then there was very little difference between small and large group sessions. Differences ranged from 1% to 4%.

If degrees of reaction are compared (i.e. strongly positive or strongly negative reactions) then the evidence clearly favors the small groups. Differences in reaction on the four major questions (Openness of communications, Relevance, Involvement, and Knowledge gained) ranged from 7% to 24%. Small groups were most strongly favored for Involvement and Openness.

Differences between morning and afternoon groups were, in one sense, more important than differences between large and small groups. All responses, whether positive or very positive responses were compared, favored the morning groups. Differences in the gross positive comparisons (i.e. the yes-no type of comparison) were generally greater than the comparisons between various degrees of positive or negative reaction.

Table 1 illustrates these comparisons.

In general, it appears that the small group approach had no great advantage over the large group approach in terms of whether or not a participant reported a given opinion, but that the small groups, more than the large, tended to affirm or enhance the degree to which that opinion was reported.

Morning groups, more than afternoon groups, consistently resulted in more positive results whether or not favorable reactions, or degrees of favorableness, were compared.

Table 1

Differences Between A.M. and P.M. Groups and Between Small and Large Groups for Positive and Very Positive Responses

Objective	Amount of Difference and Group Favored: Positive Responses		Very Positive Responses	
A.M. vs. P.M. Groups				
Open communications	13%	A.M.	6%	A.M.
Relevance	12%	A.M.	6%	A.M.
Involvement	7%	A.M.	10%	A.M.
Knowledge gained	9%	A.M.	3%	A.M.
Small (15) vs. Large (30) Groups				
Open communications	2%	Small	24%	Small
Relevance	4%	Large	10%	Small
Involvement	1%	Small	16%	Small
Knowledge gained	1%	Small	7%	Small

Evaluation Question 6: How valuable were the presentations made by the consultants hired by the Institute for Desegregation?

About two out of ten conference participants rated the presentations "Excellent," seven out of ten rated them "satisfactory," and slightly more than one in ten (12%) rated them "Not satisfactory." This rating was a general reaction of participants to all the presentations. Reactions to individual consultants were more favorable.

The value of the presentations of individual consultants was measured by comparing responses made by participants on each question dealing with the four major goals of the conference. Thus, it was possible to estimate the percentage of conference participants which thought consultant X had conducted a group, or groups, in which a free and open exchange of ideas on desegregation had taken place, in which the discussions were relevant to the conference theme, in which they felt actively involved, and in which useful knowledge had been gained.

Favorable and Very Favorable Ratings Compared

Table 2 on page 12, shows the percentage of participants reacting favorably or very favorably to the consultants they heard. The number of participants on which these percentages are based varies with the number of participants attending each presentation. Theoretically, each consultant should have talked to thirty participants, fifteen in each of two small groups. Deviations from this schedule occurred, but in no case are percentages based on fewer than 13 participants.

On the average, 85% of the conference participants rated the consultants as of at least some value across each of the four goals. The range of favorable or very favorable response was 67% to 96%. About two-thirds (67%) of the participants who heard consultant N rated the activities in his group as favorable or very favorable. In consultant K's group, 96% of the respondents gave favorable or very favorable ratings -- on the average across the four goals.

(Ratings were not direct ratings of the consultants. These estimates of consultant effectiveness are based on the responses of participants in their groups to questions A, B, C, D of the questionnaire; see Appendix A.

Table 2

Percentage of Conference Participants Reacting Favorably or Very Favorably to Each Consultant for Each of the Four Major Conference Goals

	Consultant	Open Communications	Relevance	Active Involvement	Useful Knowledge	Average
A	Barbee	83%	89%	89%	95%	89%
B	Carle	88	96	76	80	85
C	Glatt	84	88	84	80	84
D	Greer	84	81	84	66	79
E	Hawkins/Clark	89	96	82	93	90
F	Ignas	86	86	90	90	88
G	Jones	82	88	83	88	85
H	Kemp/Guines	73	90	86	82	83
I	Kontos	65	65	86	52	67
J	Mormon	92	88	92	64	84
K	Rivers	100	100	92	93	96
L	Roye	73	77	69	73	73
M	Self	94	83	97	85	90
N	Steiner	72	59	77	59	67
O	Taborn	82	93	93	82	88
P	Wilderson	85	100	78	77	85
	Median	84%	88%	85%	81%	85%
	Range	65 - 100%	59 - 100%	69 - 97%	52 - 95%	67 - 96%

N ranges from 13 to 36

For each question, the first response category is considered very favorable, the second category is considered favorable or satisfactory, and the last two categories are considered unfavorable. Thus, question B, asking about the relevance of the group discussion has responses of "very relevant" (very favorable), "somewhat relevant" (favorable) and "Not at all relevant" or "Did not attend or Other Answers" (unsatisfactory). Few respondents answered "Did not attend or Other Answers" for any question).

The goal of relevant discussions appears to have been achieved by most consultants -- at least to some degree -- with a median of 88% of the respondents giving a favorable (somewhat relevant) or very favorable (very relevant) response. Median favorable or very favorable responses for the other goals were involvement - 85%, open communications - 84%, and useful knowledge - 81%.

Results varied with individual consultants, but for each consultant, and for each goal, at least half of the respondents gave favorable or very favorable responses. Also, for each goal there was at least one consultant who received favorable or very favorable responses from almost all of the people in the groups to which he made presentations. The range of favorable and very favorable responses to the consultants for each goal were: open communications - 65% to 100%, involvement - 69% to 97%, relevance - 59% to 100%, and useful knowledge - 52% to 95%.

Very favorable ratings compared

While a review of the combined favorable and very favorable ratings has given some idea of the reaction to each of the consultants, a comparison of the very favorable ratings, alone, may help to give a better picture of the relative effectiveness -- or popularity -- of each of the consultants. Few conference participants gave unsatisfactory ratings to any of the conference activities. Even the meeting rooms which were extremely hot and drew many negative criticisms -- in discussions -- tended to receive "satisfactory" ratings rather than "not satisfactory" ratings although few "very satisfactory" ratings were given. In brief, it appears that participants tended to give moderate ratings even when they were dissatisfied. For this reason, a comparison of very favorable, or excellent, ratings may yield a better index of effectiveness than the combined ratings of very favorable and favorable.

Table 3, on page 15, shows the percentage of participants giving the highest ratings, or very favorable ratings, for each consultant group for each conference goal.

On the average, responses to the consultants were about evenly divided between very favorable and favorable ratings. The median percentage of participants giving very favorable ratings was 43% while the median giving favorable or satisfactory ratings was 42%. Very favorable ratings varied considerably for individual consultants. Consultant O, for example, was given very favorable ratings by 60% of the people in his group. Consultant N, received only 26% of such ratings.

When the extremely favorable ratings are used as an index of conference goal attainment then the goal of imparting useful knowledge about integration steps to be taken falls short of the other goals. Only 21% of conference participants gave very positive responses to the achievement of this goal. Other goals received 45% to 55% very favorable ratings. Only 4% of the participants in Consultant I's groups felt they had received much useful knowledge. In only one group (Consultant G) did more than 50% of the participants feel much useful knowledge had been obtained.

Table 3

Percentage of Conference Participants Reacting Very Favorably to Each Consultant for Each of the Four Major Conference Goals

	Consultant	Open Communications	Relevance	Active Involvement	Useful Knowledge	Average
A	Barbee	39%	67%	50%	28%	46%
B	Carle	42	63	55	25	46
C	Glatt	48	60	72	20	50
D	Greer	48	36	54	15	38
E	Hawkins/Clark	50	46	46	22	41
F	Ignas	38	62	71	38	52
G	Jones	53	65	65	53	59
H	Kemp/Guines	34	47	73	30	46
I	Kontos	35	30	43	4	28
J	Mormon	40	28	52	12	33
K	Rivers	60	67	81	19	57
L	Roye	23	35	42	15	29
M	Self	52	50	64	33	50
N	Steiner	36	14	50	5	26
O	Taborn	53	70	70	47	60
P	Wilderson	54	46	39	15	39
	Median	45%	49%	55%	21%	43%
	Range	23 - 60	14 - 70	39 - 81	4 - 53	26 - 60

Table 4 shows how consultants were ranked on the basis of the responses shown in Tables 2 and 3. The first column gives rankings based on very favorable ratings only. The second column shows rankings based on very favorable and favorable ratings. Ranks are given for each of the four conference goals and for an average of the four goals.

The Table shows that there is general agreement in the lowest rankings. Consultants I, N, and L received the lowest average ranks of 14, 15 or 16 whether they were ranked according to the combined ratings or the very favorable ratings only.

The higher ranks are not as consistent. Although consultants O, K, M, and F rank high by either index, consultant G appears in a relatively unfavorable position (rank 11.5) when ranked by the combined ratings, but appears in a tie for second place when extremely favorable ratings alone are compared. Conversely, consultant E looks good on the combined ratings, but not so good on the excellent rating, dropping from rank 3 to rank 10.

Consultants were not always rated equally for their effectiveness in progress toward each goal. For example, consultant P received the second highest rank for Open Communications (very favorable ratings) but the lowest rank for Active Involvement.

Two points should be remembered when interpreting Table 4. First, the ranks give relative positions. It is possible for all consultants to have favorable ratings. Table 2 shows that all consultants received favorable or very favorable ratings from at least two-thirds of the participants. Table 3 shows that six consultants received very favorable ratings from at least half the conference participants. Second, the ratings are not <u>direct</u> ratings of the consultants. The ratings reflect participants' reactions to what took place in their groups. Group composition, previous group activity, and other factors could have influenced the ratings.

It should also be remembered that these ratings are indirect responses to <u>individual</u> consultants. When school personnel were asked to give their general reaction to all consultants' presentations only 19% rated them very favorable while 69% rated them satisfactory and 12% rated them not satisfactory. The apparent discrepancy between the response to individual consultants and the general response to the two or more consultants which each participant heard may result from a form of "averaging" of reactions in which favorable responses to one consultant are pulled down to a lower level by unfavorable responses to another consultant, thus yielding a lower overall rating for all the "presentations."

Table 3

Percentage of Conference Participants Reacting Very Favorably to Each Consultant for Each of the Four Major Conference Goals

	Consultant	Open Communications	Relevance	Active Involvement	Useful Knowledge	Average
A	Barbee	39%	67%	50%	28%	46%
B	Carle	42	63	55	25	46
C	Glatt	48	60	72	20	50
D	Greer	48	36	54	15	38
E	Hawkins/Clark	50	46	46	22	41
F	Ignas	38	62	71	38	52
G	Jones	53	65	65	53	59
H	Kemp/Guines	34	47	73	30	46
I	Kontos	35	30	43	4	28
J	Mormon	40	28	52	12	33
K	Rivers	60	67	81	19	57
L	Roye	23	35	42	15	29
M	Self	52	50	64	33	50
N	Steiner	36	14	50	5	26
O	Taborn	53	70	70	47	60
P	Wilderson	54	46	39	15	39
	Median	45%	49%	55%	21%	43%
	Range	23 - 60	14 - 70	39 - 81	4 - 53	26 - 60

Table 4 shows how consultants were ranked on the basis of the responses shown in Tables 2 and 3. The first column gives rankings based on very favorable ratings only. The second column shows rankings based on very favorable and favorable ratings. Ranks are given for each of the four conference goals and for an average of the four goals.

The Table shows that there is general agreement in the lowest rankings. Consultants I, N, and L received the lowest average ranks of 14, 15 or 16 whether they were ranked according to the combined ratings or the very favorable ratings only.

The higher ranks are not as consistent. Although consultants O, K, M, and F rank high by either index, consultant G appears in a relatively unfavorable position (rank 11.5) when ranked by the combined ratings, but appears in a tie for second place when extremely favorable ratings alone are compared. Conversely, consultant E looks good on the combined ratings, but not so good on the excellent rating, dropping from rank 3 to rank 10.

Consultants were not always rated equally for their effectiveness in progress toward each goal. For example, consultant P received the second highest rank for Open Communications (very favorable ratings) but the lowest rank for Active Involvement.

Two points should be remembered when interpreting Table 4. First, the ranks give relative positions. It is possible for all consultants to have favorable ratings. Table 2 shows that all consultants received favorable or very favorable ratings from at least two-thirds of the participants. Table 3 shows that six consultants received very favorable ratings from at least half the conference participants. Second, the ratings are not <u>direct</u> ratings of the consultants. The ratings reflect participants' reactions to what took place in their groups. Group composition, previous group activity, and other factors could have influenced the ratings.

It should also be remembered that these ratings are indirect responses to <u>individual</u> consultants. When school personnel were asked to give their general reaction to all consultants' presentations only 19% rated them very favorable while 69% rated them satisfactory and 12% rated them not satisfactory. The apparent discrepancy between the response to individual consultants and the general response to the two or more consultants which each participant heard may result from a form of "averaging" of reactions in which favorable responses to one consultant are pulled down to a lower level by unfavorable responses to another consultant, thus yielding a lower overall rating for all the "presentations."

Table 4

Consultants Ranked by Percentage of Very Favorable Ratings and by Combined Ratings of Very Favorable and Favorable for Each of Four Conference Goals

Consultant	Open Communications		Relevance		Active Involvement		Useful Knowledge		Average	
	Very Favorable	Very Favorable or Favorable	Very Favorable	Very Favorable or Favorable	Very Favorable	Very Favorable or Favorable	Very Favorable	Very Favorable or Favorable	Very Favorable	Very Favorable or Favorable
O. Taborn	3.5	11.5	1	5	5	2	2	7.5	1	5.5
K. Rivera	1	1	2.5	1.5	1	3.5	10	2.5	2.5	1
G. Jones	3.5	11.5	4	9	6	11	1	5	2.5	11.5
M. Self	5	2	8	12	7	1	4	6	4	2
F. Ignas	12	6	6	11	4	5	3	4	5	5.5
C. Glatt	7.5	8.5	7	9	3	9.5	9	9.5	6	11.5
B. Carle	9	5	5	3.5	8	15	7	9.5	7	9
A. Barbee	11	10	2.5	7	11.5	6	6	1	8.5	4
H. Kemp-Guines	15	11.5	9	9	2	11	5	5	8.5	11.5
E. Hawkins/Clark	6	4	10.5	3.5	13	12	8	2.5	10	3
P. Wilderson	2	7	10.5	1.5	16	13	12	11	11.5	8
D. Greer	7.5	8.5	12	13	9	9.5	12	13	11.5	13
J. Morman	10	3	15	9	10	3.5	14	14	13	7
N. Steiner	13	15	16	16	11.5	14	15	15	14	16
L. Roye	16	13.5	13	14	15	16	12	12	15	15
I. Kontos	14	16	14	15	14	7.5	16	16	16	14

Rank 1 = Most Favorable

16 = Least Favorable

.5 = Tie in Ranks

Another question put to conference participants may give some information on the contribution of consultants. The question, "What impact do you think this conference had?" was followed by a list of twelve outcomes. Participants were asked to indicate each outcome which applied to them. Although responses to this broadly stated question could have been influenced by many things other than consultants, e.g. contact with peers, it may be possible to infer consultant influence for some of the responses.

Table 5

What impact do you think this conference had?

	Percentage of Participants Agreeing With Statement
1. Provided me with useful general information about desegregation.	78%
2. Improved my communications with other school personnel.	67
3. Gave me a better picture of how desegregation plans and school curriculum should be related.	41
4. Gave me a better picture of legal issues involved in desegregation.	38
5. Informed me of specific resources I could go to for help.	36
6. Improved the attitude of some of my colleagues about the practicality of our desegregation plans.	35
7. Improved my confidence in being able to do the job.	34
8. Improved my communications with cabinet level administrators.	16
9. Provided me with specific steps to take for desegregation.	16
10. Gave some of my colleagues a more favorable view of the community.	15
11. Gave me a general desegregation model to follow.	9
12. None, as far as how I do my job is concerned.	5

Responses suggest that the impact of the conference was more general than specific. Less than 20% of the respondents felt that they had been provided with a desegregation model or specific steps to take but 78% said they had received "useful general information." About two-thirds reported improved communications with their colleagues.

Items 3 and 4 in Table 5, referring to curriculum and legal issues, may be indicative of consultant impact. Consultants speaking on legal issues received, as a group, the highest ratings from conference participants. Consultants on curriculum received mixed ratings. Two of these consultants received very high ratings and two received very low ratings.

It is not possible to relate other items in the list directly to specific consultants with any degree of confidence.

Evaluation Question 7: How did participants react to conference arrangements and facilities?

Conference participants were asked to rate conference facilities and arrangements. Location, food, registration procedures, and recreation were rated excellent by the majority of conference attendees. Relatively few people rated any of the arrangements as not satisfactory. Meeting room arrangements received the most unfavorable ratings (13%) apparently because of the extreme heat and the lack of air conditioning. As one participant put it, "Air conditioning is the only factor missing!" Ratings of housing, though generally satisfactory, also appear to have been influenced by the hot weather.

Here are the ratings, in percentages, for each of the conference facilities or arrangements:

Table 6

How do you feel about each of these conference arrangements?

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory and Other Answers
Food	90%	10%	0%
Registration	79	21	0
Recreation	60	27	13
The location	60	26	12
Housing	49	41	9
Meeting room arrangements	36	51	13
The presentations	19	69	12

It seems clear that most aspects of the conference were considered excellent by most participants. Hot, humid weather caused some dissatisfaction with meeting room arrangements and housing but few participants rated them unsatisfactory. Presentations received the smallest percentage of excellent ratings (19%) and the highest percentage of satisfactory ratings (69%). Again, few participants (12%) considered the presentations not satisfactory. As mentioned in the discussion of question 6, responses to individual consultants tended to be more favorable than responses to the presentations in general.

Some variations in reaction to the conference arrangements occurred among the groups responding. For example, almost one-third of the female conference attendees said they did not participate in recreational activities or that the activities were not satisfactory. Only eight percent of males gave those responses.

Superintendents and directors tended to give more moderate ratings of food and housing than did other groups. Only 24% of the superintendents' group rated housing as excellent compared with over 50% in the other groups. About 70% of the superintendents' group rated food excellent compared with 90% of the principals and 100% of consultants, project administrators and other administrators. Superintendents and directors also tended to give fewer unsatisfactory ratings for food and housing than did other groups.

Should next year's conference be held at St. John's? About two out of three respondents said yes. Some noticeable differences in response to this question occurred. It appears that the St. John location was most appealing to relatively inexperienced administrators, to males, and to those working with secondary schools. Females, elementary school principals, and administrators with twelve or more years experience tended to be less favorably inclined to return to St. John's.

Seventy percent of the men but only 48% of the women wanted future conferences to be held at St. John's. Over one-third of the women wanted future conferences to be in the city.

A bare majority (53%) of school personnel working with elementary schools preferred St. John's but over 70% of all other respondents chose St. John's over other locations.

More than eight out of ten conference participants with less than four years experience felt St. John's would be a good location for future conferences, but less than half of those administrators with twelve years or more experience wanted to return to St. John's campus.

Overall, despite dissatisfaction on the part of some small subgroups, and despite the unfortunate weather of the 1972 conference, St. John's University was viewed as a very desirable location for future conferences.

Evaluation Question 8: Was there a variation in reaction to the conference related to participant characteristics?

Some answers to this question have been given at various points throughout the report but a summary may help to highlight the differences observed.

Comparisons of responses made by various subgroups of those attending the conference were made. These comparisons were based on sex, elementary or secondary school affiliation, job title, experience, experience working with Blacks or Indians, and race. A fuller description is given on page 5.

Three-hundred-eight statistical comparisons were made and 45, about 14 percent, proved statistically significant at the .05 level.

Twenty-four of these statistically significant differences between groups related to the conference program while nine related to conference facilities or arrangements, and twelve related to differences in the characteristics of the conference participants.

Program Differences

Few differences in reaction to the program were observed based on sex, elementary or secondary affiliation, and experience with Blacks or Indians.

Eighteen of the twenty-four statistically significant differences were attributed to differences in experience, job title, or race of conference attendees. In general, it appears that the more experienced administrators, those with 12 or more years experience, felt that they benefitted more from the conference than did less experienced administrators. Thus, more of the experienced administrators felt that they got a better picture of legal issues involved in desegregation (51% versus 38% for the total group), got a better picture of how desegregation plans and school curriculum should be related (51% to 40%), and felt that their confidence in being able to do the job had improved (49% to 34%). A significantly smaller percentage of the less experienced administrators (0 to 3 years) said they got useful general information about desegregation (63% to 78% for the total group).

When comparisons were made by job title, it was found that more administrators in the superintendents and directors group appear to have benefitted from the program. More superintendents and directors reported having gained some useful knowledge about steps they could take to improve integration in the schools than did principals or consultants. Also, more superintendents and directors felt that the attitude of some of their colleagues about the practicality of the desegregation plan had improved (51% versus 35% total). Fewer consultants and project administrators felt that they had been informed of specific resources they could go to for help than did principals or superintendents (27% to 38%).

Comparisons of school administrators by race yielded the most substantial differences in opinions about the program. More Black administrators felt that the sessions were relevant to the theme of the conference than did non-Black administrators. More Black administrators also felt that the exchange of ideas in the Thursday group was very guarded or defensive. This reaction was particularly true for the afternoon group. In the small group in the morning more Black administrators felt that the exchange was very guarded or defensive, but more Black administrators also felt that the exchange of ideas was very free and open.

This polarity among Black administrators also was observed in the response of Black administrators to the value of the morning session. More Blacks felt that the morning sessions were very valuable (64% to 32% for non-Blacks) but more Black administrators also thought that the morning session was of no value (21% to 12%).

Fewer Black administrators than non-Blacks said that they got generally useful information about desegregation from the conference. Additionally, fewer Black administrators said that their communication with other school administrators had improved. On the other hand, more Blacks said that they got a better picture of legal issues involved in desegregation and more Black administrators than white administrators felt that the attitudes of some of their colleagues about the practicality of the desegregation plan had improved.

Other minor differences were noted. More females found the discussions in the morning group of 30 to be relevant than did males. More females also felt that they gained more useful knowledge in the afternoon group of 30. Administrators who worked solely with elementary schools found the afternoon groups to be less relevant than did secondary administrators.

Administrators who had more experience working with Black people (this group excludes the Black administrators) felt that the attitudes of some of their colleagues about the practicality of the desegregation plan had improved more so than administrators who had relatively little experience working with Black people. Those administrators who had little or no experience working with Indians were more inclined to feel that morning small group was more relevant than did those administrators who had some experience working with Indians.

Differences in reaction to conference facilities and arrangements

Generally, there was little difference in attitude toward conference facilities and arrangements among administrators on the basis of experience, race, experience with Blacks or Indians, or elementary and secondary school affiliation.

Substantial differences were observed based on sex and job title.

Fewer female administrators found the recreation available at St. John's excellent (41% to 65% for males), and fewer participated in recreational activities (24% to 6%). Almost one-third of the female administrators were not satisfied with the recreational facilities compared to eight percent of the men. Perhaps for this reason, fewer female administrators rated the location as excellent (38% to 66%) and more females rated the location as not satisfactory (21% to 8%). Fewer women wanted to return to St. John's for future conferences (48% to 71% for the men).

Despite these substantial differences in male and female responses, it should be remembered that the differences are relative. In fact, more women wished to return to St. John's for future conferences than to any other location. Forty-eight percent of the women felt that St. John's would make a good future site compared with 36 percent who wished to meet in the city and 16 percent who wished to go to some other location.

Fewer administrators in the superintendent's and director's category gave very favorable ratings to the location, to the housing, or to the food than did administrators in other job categories. At the same time, superintendents tended to give less unfavorable ratings to housing. Possibly these reactions merely indicate a set on the part of top level administrators to give more moderate responses to everything. Again, it should be remembered that the differences are relative and that the overall response for all groups to the facilities was favorable.

Experience was very directly related to the question of whether or not to return to St. John's. The more experience an administrator had the more likely he or she was to want to hold the conference in the city rather than at St. John's. Nevertheless, even the most experienced administrators favored St. John's. The table below shows this relationship.

Years of Experience	Conference should be held in: St. John's	Mpls.
0 - 3	83%	8%
4 - 6	72	22
7 - 12	59	36
Over 12	46	42

Totals do not add to 100% because some respondents selected other locations.

Fewer elementary school administrators preferred the St. John location than secondary administrators or personnel who worked with both elementary and secondary. Possibly this response is related to sex, since there were few secondary school female administrators. Nearly all females at the conference were in the elementary schools or in the combined elementary-secondary category.

Administrators who claimed more experience working with Indians also gave more favorable ratings to housing.

This summarization of the differences in response of conference participants should not obliterate two facts. First, they should not conceal the overall responses. Second, they should not give the impression that the differences were greater than the similarities; they should not conceal the essential similarity of response. Two-hundred-sixty-three of the 308 statistical comparisons made revealed no significant differences between any of these subgroups. For example, no differences were found among participants in the extent of involvement in the conference. No differences were found in their responses to the presentations made by the consultants, the provision of specific steps to be taken for desegregation, or for obtaining a general desegregation model to follow. Similarly, their perception of improved communications with the cabinet level administrators and of colleagues attitudes towards the community, showed no significant differences. Reactions to registration procedures and meeting room facilities were similar.

Substantial differences which were observed were not necessarily unfavorable. More experienced administrators appeared to benefit from the conference. Higher level administrators appeared to gain much. Black administrators appeared to have mixed reactions about various aspects of the program, some of them positive and some of them negative.

Few differences occurred in reaction to facilities, but female administrators did appear to have less favorable views of the recreation available.

V. Discussion and Conclusions

The 1972 St. John's Conference appeared to have made moderate progress towards its four major goals. Conference participants felt that open communications on the topic of desegregation took place; they felt that group discussions were relevant to the theme of the conference, and most felt that they had gained knowledge about steps to be taken to improve integration in the schools. Progress towards these three goals is somewhat marred by the fact that only half of the administrators reported feeling actively involved in conference activities. Additionally, communications, relevance, and involvement, appeared to decline as the day progressed. The morning sessions were consistently rated more favorably than afternoon sessions.

The decline in favorable response from morning to afternoon appears to have been directly related to program content rather than to extraneous factors which could have influenced the program such as the uncomfortable heat. Write-in comments suggest that the heat was a nuisance factor but that it did not override the judgment of the conference participants about the program content or the location of the conference.

Several limitations to the evaluation approach should be noted.

Only a portion of the conference was actually evaluated. No questions were directed to the Wednesday night activities. The evaluation was completed prior to the Superintendent's closing speech. Some write-in comments suggest that the Wednesday night activities had a limited impact on conference participants. The standing ovation given to the Superintendent's closing comments suggests that if the questionnaire had been distributed following his comments the general reaction to the conference may have been more favorable.

Evaluation results are based on immediate reactions. Whether or not these reactions hold up over a longer period of time is conjectural. Also, there is no direct behavioral measure of conference impact. All evaluation comments are in terms of expressed opinions.

The final limitation of the study is the limited sample of participants. Our best estimate is that about 60 participants did not complete questionnaires and had left the conference prior to the closing session. Whether or not these early leavers left for reasons connected to the conference quality is unknown.

It appears that the small group approach had no great advantage over the large group approach in terms of whether or not a participant reported a given opinion, but that the small groups, more than the large, tended to enhance the degree to which that opinion was held or reported. A difference in impact of the small and large groups appears to have been most noticable for open communications and involvement. The smallest difference was in terms of knowledge gained. However, it appears that the quality of the activity within the groups was more important than the size of the groups. Morning groups consistently produced more favorable reactions than did afternoon groups. Small groups had more favorable responses than large groups except in the area of relevance, but the differences were small unless the extreme responses were compared.

Some variation in reaction to progress toward the conference goals was noted for some groups attending the conference. However, there was no difference in the degree of involvement reported by any of the subgroups. Blacks and whites, men and women, elementary and secondary, all reported similar amounts of involvement in conference activities. Of particular interest is the observation that the conference was at least as beneficial and probably more beneficial to the more experienced school administrators and to administrators in higher level positions. Administrators with 12 or more years experience and superintendents and directors all reported more beneficial gains in certain areas than did lesser experienced personnel or personnel working at lower administrative levels. In general, however, the major finding is one of greater similarity among the subgroups than of difference. The greatest difference in response to program activities occurred for Black and white administrators. These differences were variable. For some activities the Black administrators were more favorably

impressed; for other activities, Black administrators were less favorably impressed. A number of differences were noted between male and female administrators' reactions, but these reactions were directed more to conference facilities than to program content.

VI. Recommendations

1. Other things equal, the 1973 administrators' conference should be held at St. John's University. A majority of administrators felt that the St. John facility was an excellent one for the conference.
2. Conference arrangements were well handled and similar procedures should be followed.

   Registration, food, living quarters and recreation were all considered very favorably by the majority of the participants. The one consistent complaint was about the heat and humidity. Improved air-conditioning facilities at St. John's, now under construction, should alleviate some of that problem should the weather again be uncomfortable.
3. Some exploration of different recreational opportunities for female participants should be considered.

   Many female participants did not take part in recreational activities or did not feel satisfied with the recreational activities offered. Possibly this dissatisfaction is related more to separation from home and family responsibilities than to the actual recreational opportunities at St. John's University. More of the older administrators also expressed desire to have the conference in the city rather than at a distant facility.
4. Consideration should be given to a more balanced program for elementary and secondary administrators.

   Elementary administrators felt that the afternoon program, in particular, was more directed toward secondary administrators.
5. Consultants to be used at future conferences should have first hand knowledge of the Minneapolis situation either through direct experience or through a pre-training program which orients them to specific local problems. A number of write-in comments indicated that the consultants presentations were too broad or too ignorant of local problems. Consultants spoke from personal experiences in cities

which frequently had little in common with Minneapolis.

6. Consideration for evaluating the program should be begun early in the planning period and evaluation questions should be directed to the entire conference, not to just a portion of it. No evaluation questions were directed to the Wednesday night activities. The relation of these activities to the Thursday program were not made evident to either conference participants or evaluators.

Appendix A

Participant Responses (Percent)

Minneapolis Public Schools

St. John's Conference August 16 - 18, 1972
Evaluation

A. How would you describe the exchange of ideas in each of your Thursday groups? (circle the one response number which best describes each of the four groups).

Group	Very Free and Open Exchange	Some Exchange of Ideas	Very Guarded or Defensive	Did Not Attend or Other Answers
1. A.M. - group of 15	1 (51%)	2 (39%)	3 (8%)	4 (2%)
2. A.M. - group of 30	1 (17)	2 (74)	3 (8)	4 (1)
3. P.M. - group of 15	1 (35)	2 (44)	3 (14)	4 (7)
4. P.M. - group of 30	1 (21)	2 (54)	3 (22)	4 (3)

Comment: _____

_____

B. How relevant to the theme of the conference was the discussion in each group?

	Very Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Not at all Relevant	Did Not Attend or Other Answers
5. A.M. - group of 15	1 (56%)	2 (37%)	3 (6%)	4 (1%)
6. A.M. - group of 30	1 (35)	2 (58)	3 (6)	4 (1)
7. P.M. - group of 15	1 (38)	2 (40)	3 (17)	4 (5)
8. P.M. - group of 30	1 (40)	2 (45)	3 (12)	4 (3)

Comment: _____

_____

C. Did you feel actively involved in each of the four groups?

	Yes	No, but I had the opportunity to be involved	No. There was not enough opportunity for involvement	Did Not Attend or Other Answers
9. A.M. - group of 15	1 (65%)	2 (25%)	3 (10%)	4 (0%)
10. A.M. - group of 30	1 (45)	2 (42)	3 (12)	4 (1)
11. P.M. - group of 15	1 (51)	2 (30)	3 (14)	4 (5)
12. P.M. - group of 30	1 (39)	2 (43)	3 (14)	4 (4)

Comment: _____

_____

N=190 (Minimum)

D. Did you gain useful knowledge about steps you can take to improve integration in the schools from each of the four groups?

	Yes, much useful information	Some useful information was obtained	No	Did Not Attend or Other Answers
13. A.M. - group of 15	1 (26%)	2 (60%)	3 (13%)	4 (1%)
14. A.M. - group of 30	1 (13)	2 (67)	3 (19)	4 (1)
15. P.M. - group of 15	1 (17)	2 (55)	3 (24)	4 (4)
16. P.M. - group of 30	1 (17)	2 (62)	3 (18)	4 (3)

Comment: _____

_____

E. Which A. M. presentation did you hear? (circle one)

17. A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4

18. B_1 B_2 B_3 B_4

19. C_1 C_2 C_3 C_4

20. D_1 D_2 D_3 D_4

21. None

F. Which P. M. presentation did you hear? (circle one)

22. A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4

23. B_1 B_2 B_3 B_4

24. C_1 C_2 C_3 C_4

25. D_1 D_2 D_3 D_4

26. None

G. How valuable were each of these presentations to you?

	Very Valuable	Of Some Value	Little or no Value	Did not Attend or Other Answers
27. A.M. Presentation	1 (35%)	2 (52%)	3 (13%)	4 (0%)
28. P.M. Presentation	1 (19)	2 (58)	3 (20)	4 (3)

Comment: _____

_____

H. What impact do you think this conference had? (check as many responses as apply)

29. (16%) Provided me with specific steps to take for desegregation

30. (78%) Provided me with useful general information about desegregation

31. (9%) Gave me a general desegregation model to follow

(continued)

H. (continued)

32. (34%) Improved my confidence in being able to do the job
33. (35%) Improved the attitude of some of my colleagues about the practicality of our desegregation plans.
34. (36%) Informed me of specific resources I can go to for help
35. (67%) Improved my communications with other school personnel
36. (15%) Gave some of my colleagues a more favorable view of the community
37. (16%) Improved my communications with cabinet level administrators
38. (41%) Gave me a better picture of how desegregation plans and school curriculum should be related
39. (38%) Gave me a better picture of legal issues involved in desegregation
40. (5%) None, as far as how I do my job is concerned

Comment: _____

_____

I. How do you feel about each of these conference arrangements? (circle the number)

		Excellent	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Did not Attend or Other Answers
41.	Housing	1 (49%)	2 (41%)	3 (9%)	4 (1%)
42.	Food	1 (90)	2 (10)	3	4 (0)
43.	Meeting room arrangements	1 (36)	2 (51)	3 (13)	4
44.	The presentations	1 (19)	2 (69)	3 (12)	4 (0)
45.	Registration	1 (79)	2 (21)	3	4
46.	Recreation	1 (60)	2 (27)	3 (3)	4 (10)
47.	The location	1 (60)	2 (26)	3 (12)	4 (2)

Comment: _____

_____

J. Where would you like future conferences to be held? (check one)

48. (66%) 1. St. John's
(26%) 2. In the city
(8%) 3. Someplace else. Specify _____

K. What is your present job title?

49. (4%) 1. Superintendent, associate superintendent, or assistant superintendent
(61%) 2. Principal, assistant principal, or administrative assistant
(13%) 3. Director or assistant director
(9%) 4. Consultant
(6%) 5. Project administrator
(0%) 6. Administrative intern
(7%) 7. Other

L. Do you work primarily with:

50. (38%)1. Elementary schools

(37%)2. Secondary schools

(24%)3. Both elementary and secondary schools

M. Can you think of any critical steps which should be taken within the next 3 or 4 months which have not been brought to the attention of the Leadership Development Committee?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

N. Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

51 - 53. ____ _____ _____

RWF/BN:dm
8/14/72

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division

54. O. How long have you been a school administrator?

1 (30%) 0-3 years

2 (26%) 4-6 years

3 (21%) 7-12 years

4 (23%) more than 12 years

55. P. What kind of certificate did you hold before becoming an administrator?

1 (39%) Elementary

2 (48%) Secondary

3 (2%) Special Education

4 (1%) School Psychology

5 (2%) School Social Work

6 (4%) Other

7 (4%) None

56. Q. Sex?

1 (83%) Male

2 (17%) Female

57. R. How much experience have you had working with Black people? (circle one)

1	2	3	4	5
None or practically none				A Lot
(4%)	(12%)	(19%)	(24%)	(41%)

58. S. With Indians?

1	2	3	4	5
None or practically none				A Lot
(19%)	(30%)	(26%)	(9%)	(16%)

59. 1 White (46%)

2 Black (7%)

3 Not Identified (47%)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Minneapolis Public Schools

Educational Services Division

Research and Evaluation Department

Harry N. Vakos, PhD., Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Richard W. Faunce, PhD., Director of Research and Evaluation

Lary R. Johnson, Research Assistant

Bonna Nesset, Administrative Assistant